

This time with the attachment

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 15 2006

**From:** Gordon E. Nelson [mailto:genelson@comcast.net]

**Sent:** Monday, May 15, 2006 2:50 PM

**To:** '15712738300@faxmail.com'

**Cc:** gen\_secy@comcast.net

**Subject:** Supplemental amendment in USSN 10/671,078, Parlee, "Techniques for making carbon fiber bicycle frames", attn. Examiner Allan R. Kuhns

Dear USPTO worker,

**Re:** USSN 10/671,078, Parlee, "Techniques for making carbon fiber bicycle frames", filed 9/25/03  
my docket parlee01.005

Please docket the attached *Supplemental amendment* and deliver it to Examiner Allan R. Kuhns, GAU 1732.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon E. Nelson, #30,093,  
Attorney of record  
Gordon E. Nelson, Patent Attorney, PC

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 15 2006

parlee01.005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
(parlee01.005)

<b>Applicant:</b>	Robert Parlee	<b>Paper No.:</b>
<b>Application No:</b>	10/671,078	<b>Group Art Unit:</b> 1732
<b>Filed:</b>	9/25/03	<b>Examiner:</b> Allan R. Kuhns Central fax: 517-273-8300

**Title:** *Techniques for making carbon fiber bicycle frames*

.....

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### Supplemental amendment

#### Background

The above application was finally rejected in an Office action mailed 10/3/05. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious over U.S. patent 5,019,312, Bishop, *Method for assembling a bicycle frame*, henceforth "Bishop". Examiner granted Applicant's attorney a telephonic interview in which no agreement was reached but Applicant's attorney gained an improved understanding of how Examiner was reading the Bishop reference. In his response to the final rejection, filed 12/30/05, Applicant's attorney amended his claims to better distinguish them from Bishop. Examiner issued an advisory action on January 19 indicating that the amendment raised new issues and that he would consequently not enter it. After several attempts to make amendments after final that would meet his client's requirements and that Examiner would enter, Applicant's attorney filed an RCE on April 3, 2003. In *Remarks* accompanying the RCE, Applicant's attorney indicated that the Submission under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 in the RCE was the unentered response of 12/30/05. Examiner mailed a first Office action in the RCE on 4/24/2006. The basis of the Office action was the claims of a response to an advisory action filed on 3/10/06. All claims were rejected as obvious over the combination of Bishop and U.S. Patent 4,954,209, Baron, *Apparatus for producing molded articles*, henceforth Baron. Applicant's attorney telephoned Examiner about the matter and

Examiner suggested that the easiest way to remedy the matter would be for Applicant to file the amendment of 12/30/05 as a supplemental amendment. Applicant is so doing and is also explaining in the *Remarks* why the claims as amended 12/30/05 are not obvious over the combination of Bishop and Baron.

**Please amend the Specification as follows:**